

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

James S. Blanding,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	C/A No. 6:14-2748-TMC
)	
vs.)	ORDER
)	
Warden, Lee Correctional Institution,)	
)	
Respondent.)	
)	

Petitioner James S. Blanding, a state inmate proceeding *pro se*, filed this Petition seeking habeas corpus relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02, D.S.C., this matter was referred to a magistrate judge for pretrial handling. Before the court is the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation (“Report”) recommending that the action be dismissed for lack of prosecution.¹ (ECF No. 37). Petitioner was advised of his right to file objections to the Report. (ECF No. 37-1). However, Petitioner has not filed any objections to the Report, and the time to do so has now run.

The Report has no presumptive weight and the responsibility to make a final determination in this matter remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). In the absence of objections, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to

¹ The Report’s recommendation is based on Petitioner’s failure to respond to Respondent’s Motion for Summary Judgment filed on December 2, 2014 (ECF No. 26), despite having been provided an extension of time in which to respond (ECF No. 33). Petitioner was specifically advised of the consequences for failing to respond to the Motion for Summary Judgment. (ECF No. 33).

accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the court adopts the Report (ECF No. 37) and incorporates it herein. Accordingly, this action is **DISMISSED** without prejudice for failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) and the factors outlined in *Chandler Leasing Corp. v. Lopez*, 669 F.2d 919, 920 (4th Cir. 1982). *See Ballard v. Carlson*, 882 F.2d 93 (4th Cir. 1989).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Timothy M. Cain
Timothy M. Cain
United States District Judge

March 25, 2015
Anderson, South Carolina

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.